ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Analysis For Total Metals By EPA Method 200.8

 Client ID:
 M07326

 Date Received:
 06/30/11

 Date Extracted:
 07/01/11

 Date Analyzed:
 07/01/11

 Matrix:
 Water

 Units:
 ug/L (ppb)

Client: A
Project: N
Lab ID: 1
Data File: 1

Alaskan Copper Works M07326, F&BI 106425 106425-01 x10

le: 106425-01 x10.055 lent: ICPMS1

Instrument: ICPM Operator: AP

Internal Standard: Germanium

 ${\bf Copper}$

Zinc

% Recovery: 79

153

<10

Lower Limit: 60 Upper Limit: 125

	Concentration ug/L (ppb)		
Analyte:			
Chromium	224		
Nickel	112		

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Operator:

Analysis For Total Metals By EPA Method 200.8

Client ID: Method Blank
Date Received: Not Applicable
Date Extracted: 07/01/11
Date Analyzed: 07/01/11
Matrix: Water
Units: ug/L (ppb)

Client: Alaskan Copper Works
Project: M07326, F&BI 106425
Lab ID: I1-451 mb
Data File: I1-451 mb.040
Instrument: ICPMS1

AP

Lower Upper Internal Standard: % Recovery: Limit: Limit: Germanium 88 60 125

Concentration
ug/L (ppb)

Chromium

Nickel

Copper

Zinc

Concentration
ug/L (ppb)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Date of Report: 07/06/11 Date Received: 06/30/11

Project: M07326, F&BI 106425

QUALITY ASSURANCE RESULTS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES FOR TOTAL METALS USING EPA METHOD 200.8

Laboratory Code: 106394-01 (Matrix Spike)

				Percent	Percent		
	Reporting	Spike	Sample	Recovery	Recovery	Acceptance	RPD
Analyte	Units	Level	Result	MS	MSD	Criteria	(Limit 20)
Chromium	ug/L (ppb)	20	<1	105	109	67-132	4
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	2.70	103	107	73-119	4
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	1.47	100	105	50-144	5
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	3.22	101	108	46-148	7

Laboratory Code: Laboratory Control Sample

	Percent						
	Reporting	Spike	Recovery	Acceptance			
Analyte	Units	Level	LCS	Criteria			
Chromium	ug/L (ppb)	20	110	66-135			
Nickel	ug/L (ppb)	20	110	67-134			
Copper	ug/L (ppb)	20	108	66-134			
Zinc	ug/L (ppb)	50	107	57-135			

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

Data Qualifiers & Definitions

- a The analyte was detected at a level less than five times the reporting limit. The RPD results may not provide reliable information on the variability of the analysis.
- A1 More than one compound of similar molecule structure was identified with equal probability.
- b The analyte was spiked at a level that was less than five times that present in the sample. Matrix spike recoveries may not be meaningful.
- ca The calibration results for this range fell outside of acceptance criteria. The value reported is an estimate.
- c The presence of the analyte indicated may be due to carryover from previous sample injections.
- d The sample was diluted. Detection limits may be raised due to dilution.
- ds The sample was diluted. Detection limits are raised due to dilution and surrogate recoveries may not be meaningful.
- dv Insufficient sample was available to achieve normal reporting limits and limits are raised accordingly.
- fb Analyte present in the blank and the sample.
- fc The compound is a common laboratory and field contaminant.
- hr The sample and duplicate were reextracted and reanalyzed. RPD results were still outside of control limits. The variability is attributed to sample inhomogeneity.
- ht Analysis performed outside the method or client-specified holding time requirement.
- ip Recovery fell outside of normal control limits. Compounds in the sample matrix interfered with the quantitation of the analyte.
- j The result is below normal reporting limits. The value reported is an estimate.
- J The internal standard associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration is an estimate,
- jl The analyte result in the laboratory control sample is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.
- jr The rpd result in laboratory control sample associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.
- js The surrogate associated with the analyte is out of control limits. The reported concentration should be considered an estimate.
- lc The presence of the compound indicated is likely due to laboratory contamination.
- L The reported concentration was generated from a library search.
- nm The analyte was not detected in one or more of the duplicate analyses. Therefore, calculation of the RPD is not applicable.
- pc The sample was received in a container not approved by the method. The value reported should be considered an estimate.
- pr The sample was received with incorrect preservation. The value reported should be considered an estimate.
- ve Estimated concentration calculated for an analyte response above the valid instrument calibration range. A dilution is required to obtain an accurate quantification of the analyte.
- vo The value reported fell outside the control limits established for this analyte.
- x The sample chromatographic pattern does not resemble the fuel standard used for quantitation.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTS

James E. Bruya, Ph.D. Charlene Morrow, M.S. Yelena Aravkina, M.S. Bradley T. Benson, B.S. Kurt Johnson, B.S. 3012 16th Avenue West Seattle, WA 98119-2029 TEL: (206) 285-8282 FAX: (206) 283-5044 e-mail: fbi@isomedia.com

July 6, 2011

Gerald Thompson, Project Manager Alaskan Copper Works 628 South Hanford Seattle, WA 98134

Dear Mr. Thompson:

Included are the results from the testing of material submitted on June 30, 2011 from the M07326, F&BI 106425 project. There are 4 pages included in this report. Any samples that may remain are currently scheduled for disposal in 30 days. If you would like us to return your samples or arrange for long term storage at our offices, please contact us as soon as possible.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you and hope you will call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRIEDMAN & BRUYA, INC.

Michael Erdahl Project Manager

Enclosures ACU0706R.DOC